

REMARKS

OBJECTIONS TO THE SPECIFICATION & COMMENTS ON EXAMINATION

The Examiner contends that Figures 6-27 and Tables 3-24 are not referenced in the specification and that there are no Examples listed under the Examples Section shown on page 54. The Applicants are concerned that the Examiner does not have the full Specification as originally mailed. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the original Specification in full and reissue an amended first Office Action, especially given that the Applicants expect that any decision on patentability will be issued after the Examiner has considered the Specification in full – including the Examples. The Applicants also contend that a **second non-final Office Action** should be issued in this case, since the Examiner admittedly did not consider the full application for the first Office Action.

The Applicants herein are correcting the Specification objections, especially since they are based purely on grammatical errors. In addition, the Applicants are addressing the Examiner's 35 USC §112 rejections, since they do not address any substantive, patentable aspects of the claims.

The Applicants are also prepared to address the Double Patenting Rejections and both the Ravichandran et al. (US 6677392) and WO 03/088344 (Leung et al.) references, but herein contend that arguments presented by the Applicants at this stage are premature and likely unnecessary, once the Examiner reviews the entire Specification.

Applicants are herein attaching a copy of the full application, including all Figures and Tables, so that the Examiner may consider the entire application before discussing patentability.

35 USC §112

Claims 2, 44, 46 and 48 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 2 recites:

“The absorbing composition of claim 1, wherein the at least one material modification agent comprises at least one adhesion promoter, at least one crosslinking agent, at least one porogen, at least one high-boiling solvent, at least one catalyst, at least one capping agent, at least one pH tuning agent or a combination thereof.”

The language of the claim indicates that the material modification agent comprises at least one of the listed material modification agents or a combination of the at least one listed material modification agents. The “or” language indicates that not all of the listed material modification agents need to be present in the composition, and the specification supports this analysis. (Please see MPEP Section 2173.05(h)). This analysis stands for claims 44, 46 and 48 also. The Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney-of-record by phone to discuss if there is still a perceived issue with claims 2, 44, 46 and 48.

Honeywell Docket No. H0005567 - 4780
Buchalter Docket No. H9930-0305

REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE

Claims 1-51, 53, and 55-56 are pending in this application. The applicants request allowance of all pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Buchalter Nemer, A Professional Corporation



Dated: March 14, 2006

By:

Sandra P. Thompson, PhD, Esq.

Reg. No. 46,264

E-mail: sthompson@buchalter.com

Direct Line: 949-224-6282

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT(S):

Buchalter Nemer, A Professional Corporation
18400 Von Karman Ave., Suite 800
Irvine, CA 92612
Fax: 949-224-6203